

U.S.C. § 103 (a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Sun in view of Suzuki (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,575).

Regarding claim 6, Applicants respectfully disagree with the allegation that the Sun et al. patent discloses the claimed feature of the display speed information indicating a number of objects displayed per a unit time. Applicants respectfully submit that no portion of the Sun et al. patent discloses display speed information indicating a number of objects displayed per a unit time. Instead, the Sun et al. patent discloses a method for encoding video objects based on a buffer level to maintain a constant bit rate output, as quoted from the Abstract (with emphasis added):

A method adaptively encodes a sequence of frames including video objects to provide a compressed video signal. The **encoding is via a buffer having a variable input rate and a constant output rate.** The encoding uses a discrete cosine transform to produce coefficients that are quantized to generate image-representative code bits at a variable rate and texture, and motion and shape information for each video object stored in the buffer. The **content of the buffer is restricted by adjusting quantization parameters with respect to a reference value and a quadratic rate distortion model to increase or decrease the number of bits stored in the buffer.** Furthermore, the target number of bits for encoding each video object is estimated in accordance with a function of relative motion and size. **The encoding bit rate is set to avoid buffer overflow.**

As clearly described above, the encoding bit rate is adjusted to avoid overflowing the buffer. The Sun et al. patent does not discuss either a decoder or display speed information indicating a number of objects displayed per a unit time.

The bit rates of the various test videos of Tables 5 and 6 correspond to the actual video encoding rates of the videos themselves. For example, Table 2 shows the following data:

<u>ID</u>	<u>Sequence</u>	<u>Bit Rate</u>	<u>Frame Rate</u>	<u>Format</u>
1	Akiyo, Container	10	7.5	QCIF
3	News	48	7.5	CIF

Therefore, the fact that the various test videos bit rates are different as encoded does not teach display speed information indicating a number of objects displayed per a unit time. Correspondingly, it is to be expected that the variable input/constant output encoder would correlate to the various input test videos bit rates (i.e., the Akiyo, Container-1 video approaches 10 (9.86) and News-3 video approaches 48 (47.68), as shown in Table 5).

Since the Examiner has specifically referenced Table 4 an analysis of Table 4 is provided below. For example, Table 4 shows the following data:

<u>ID</u>	<u>Sequence</u>	<u>Bit Rate</u>	<u>Frame Rate</u>	<u>Format</u>
6	Akiyo, Container	10	10	QCIF
7	News	192	15	CIF
8	Coastguard	384	30	CIF

Similar to Table 2 above, the "high bit-rate" simulations in Table 4 correspond to the different bit rates for the different test videos in Table 6. The Examiner has referenced Table 5 in connection with Table 4. However, Table 5 is related to Table 2 ("low-bit rate") as noted above and in column 12, lines 26-30. Clearly no relevant conclusion can be drawn from relating Tables 4 and 5 which are two non-related Tables.

However, even using the Examiner's own interpretation and looking at the results disclosed in Table 6, it is clear that the "duration" of each frame does not "indicate the number of VO's", as alleged by the Examiner. As can be clearly seen in Table 6 (column 13, lines 1-21), both the "News" and the "Coastguard" have the same number of VO's (i.e., 0-3). Therefore, the Examiner's interpretation of the Sun et al. reference is contradicted by the patent itself. Accordingly, the Sun et al. patent fails to teach display speed information indicating a number of objects displayed per a unit time, as alleged by the Examiner.

As stated in MPEP § 2131, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d

1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). "The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ...claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989). The Sun et al. reference applied by the Examiner neither expressly nor inherently describes every feature of Applicants' claimed combinations as detailed in the foregoing arguments. Therefore, Applicants respectfully submit that the applied references do not anticipate Applicants' claimed combinations as alleged by the Examiner.

Further, the teachings of the Suzuki et al. patent do not remedy the deficiencies of Sun et al., as noted above. Therefore, the combination of the Sun et al. and Suzuki et al. documents do not render the Applicants' claimed combinations obvious. Further, Applicants submit that one of ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify the systems of Sun et al. and Suzuki et al. to arrive at Applicants' claimed combinations absent impermissible hindsight reference to Applicants' specification.

For at least the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that claim 6 is distinguishable over the applied art. The remaining dependent claims 7-11 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependency on the above-identified independent claim. Moreover, these claims recite additional subject matter, which is not suggested by the documents taken either alone or in combination.

Independent claim 20 recites related subject matter to the above-identified independent claim 6 and is therefore allowable for reasons similar to those given above.

CONCLUSION

All objections and rejections raised in the Office Action having been addressed, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and such allowance is respectfully solicited. Should there be any outstanding matters that need to be resolved in the present application, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Mark E. Olds, Reg. No. 46,570, at the telephone number of the undersigned below, to conduct an interview in an effort to expedite prosecution in connection with the present application.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 02-2448 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,

BIRCH, STEWART, KOLASCH & BIRCH, LLP

By: 

Michael K. Mutter, Reg. No. 29,680
P.O. Box 747
(703) 205-8000
Falls Church, VA 22040-0747


MKM/MEO/lab.kmr